UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Paul A. Guthrie, in propria persona;

Plaintiff,

vs.

Civil Action No.

1:13 -CV- 0234 SEB -DKL

United States of America;

de facto King Barrack Hussein Obama II, the alleged President of the United States of America,

Joseph Robinette Biden Jr., the alleged Vice President of the United States of America,

Martin Dempsey, the alleged Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Office of the President of the United States of America,

Eric Holder, the alleged Attorney General of the United States of America,

John Kerry, the alleged Secretary of the United States of America,

Elena Kagan, the alleged Supreme

Court Justice of the United States of America,

Sonia Sotomayor, the alleged Supreme Court Justice of the United States of America,

Jane Magnus-Stinson, alleged Federal District Judge, 7th Judicial Circuit Indianapolis,

Patrick Leahy, the alleged President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States of America,

John Boehner, the alleged Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America,

Robert S. Mueller, III, the alleged director of the FBI of the United States of America;

Defendants.

PLANTIFF GUTHRIE'S REPLY TO JUDGE BARKER'S ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Comes now plaintiff Paul Guthrie, before the Honorable de jure Judge Sarah Evans Barker, in order to answer the Court's requirement for Guthrie to provide proof and evidence that Guthrie is not recycling claims by his filing of his complaint with the

Court, and to show that his case is not frivolous and should not be summarily dismissed, and alleges:

Summary Section

1) Guthrie will show and prove beyond any doubt, and Judge Barker may discover for herself, that the appearance that Guthrie's case is frivolous is an illusion -- mere appearance without substance -- due to the fraud being committed by Obama and his appointees, who have no lawful authority. The appearance that Guthrie is recycling claims is also an illusion due to the fraudulent judgment of dismissal by Magnus-Stinson and the fraudulent opening and closing of Guthrie's case without any authority or consent having first been obtained from Guthrie, prior to this case now before the Court. The Court will discover that because Obama is not a natural born Citizen, Magnus-Stinson acted without jurisdiction such that the Court and Magnus-Stinson were never able to obtain proper jurisdiction over Guthrie's person and case because his filing his case is not an automatic grant of permission to hear the case in this unique and unusual, historic instance.

2) To make the determination that his suit is frivolous and to summarily dismiss his suit has been done without any material facts in evidence or basis in Law in evidence to warrant such a dismissal. The definition and meaning of natural born

Citizen has been invented and made up by Magnus-Stinson and is frivolous, false, and malicious. Her judgment that Obama is a President is groundless and outside of her power and authority to declare. The actions represent a knowing and intentional act of criminal fraud upon the Court and country for purely personal political reasons, for the purpose of maintaining herself and Obama in their offices, contrary to the Constitution and Laws of the United States. Her actions represent a gross violation and dereliction of her duties and obligations as a judicial officer, and a gross dereliction and violation of her civic duties and responsibilities. Even in a light most favorable to the state, her actions are nothing but evidence of gross incompetence. Even if we ignore the substance of Magnus-Stinson's supposed determination that Guthrie's suit is frivolous, Magnus-Stinson had no proper jurisdiction over Guthrie or Guthrie's case and she cannot render any judgments. Her legitimacy as a federal judge, and her right to claim jurisdiction over Guthrie and his case, depends upon Obama's legitimacy as a President. It was factually established by Magnus-Stinson herself that Obama is not legitimate by her declaration that natural born Citizen is defined without reference to a citizen father from one of the States. Thus Magnus-Stinson has admitted to the Court with her judgment and entry against Guthrie that Obama is not qualified to hold the Office of President, and that her appointment is invalid. Magnus-Stinson took Guthrie's

case without permission, consent, or authority, even over Guthrie's objections and attempts to take the case away from her, and she purposefully, with criminal intent, interfered and blocked Guthrie's due process rights to Petition his government for a redress of grievances under the First Amendment. Thus, it is impossible for Judge Barker to rely upon the record established by Guthrie's original failed attempt to file his petition. Magnus-Stinson knew full well that she was involved in a criminal cover-up conflict and she was exposed, because two of the defendants were also Obama-appointed judges of the federal court just like she was. She knew the issue was about Obama's eligibility to appoint judges and her authority to hear the case and gain the consent from Guthrie to decide the issue. She was in the same conflict that the defendants are in, due to her appointment from Obama who is not qualified, making it impossible for her to be fair or impartial or gain proper jurisdiction over Guthrie and his case just by the mere appearance of his filing his lawsuit and its automated assignment to her. Even if Judge Barker makes her own determination anew, Judge Barker could not possibly come to the same conclusion without any material facts in evidence or basis in Law in evidence to warrant such a dismissal, as de facto judge Magnus-Stinson did. To do so now would amount to the same commission of a fraud upon the Court by Judge Barker as by Magnus-Stinson, in light of the self-evident nature of how natural born Citizen is defined

(see Part I below), and by the fact that there is no evidence of material fact in the record that is in dispute surrounding Obama's birth details or evidence in the record of a dispute in Law, basis in Law or material fact to support a finding that Guthrie's case is frivolous. What Magnus-Stinson did was part of a pattern of behavior that has emerged in many court challenges over the last four years where the judges in those cases do exactly what Magnus-Stinson did, which is simply to invent a fraudulent, frivolous, and malicious definition that excludes the male State citizen father from the definition, to just declare that Obama is a natural born Citizen or a President or a sitting President, and to summarily dismiss as frivolous on Rule 12b(6) grounds without any evidence of material fact or basis in Law to substantiate such an order. These actions have now led to a new and distinguished precedent that can be combined with a large body of similarly bad decisions made over the last four years (well over 100 cases at last count) that establishes evidence of, and a legal basis for, institutionalized sex-based discrimination of political rights in favor of female U.S. citizens and foreign non-citizen males at the expense of male U.S. State citizens, who used to be politically protected and who have now lost their political protections due to the fraudulent actions of the defendants. As a result of these fraudulent actions of the defendants, the Courts have created a political inequity between male and female U.S. citizens, because the females can

now create natural born citizens of two countries by having sex with foreign males, but the male U.S. citizen can only create natural born citizens in one country, no matter what female they have sex with. The effects of these rulings are that male citizens from States and their offspring must compete with the offspring of foreign non-citizen males for the Office of President and that female U.S citizens are granted a Title of Nobility that permits them to create natural born Citizens with foreign male non-U.S. citizens who can then become President. However, the male U.S. citizen has no such Title of Nobility bestowed upon him that he can use to his benefit or for his offspring's benefit. Thus, there is now an unfair discrimination between males' and females' political rights, with the male being bound by the Law of Nature alone to derive his political rights and claim them within the society, which limits the male U.S. citizens' political authority to the territorial boundaries of the 50 States. However, female U.S. citizens' political rights are now not based upon Natural Law, but are prescribed by statute or judge-made precedent according to the plenary authority of government under Positive Law, and therefore the political rights of female U.S. citizens are not bound by the Laws of Nature and thus they are unlimited political rights. The unlimited nature of the political rights that females now have, is reflected in the fact that now U.S. citizen females can define the political boundaries of the country to not be limited

to the territory of the 50 States, but to be global and unlimited based upon their ability to have sex with foreign non-citizen males and still produce offspring that can be President of the United States, without any consent having to be obtained from a State citizen father. This violates the natural sovereignty of the country that is naturally based upon the males and the territory of the States, and not upon the females and territory of foreign counties. The effect of these rulings is to emasculate male State citizens' sovereign authority to create natural born U.S. Citizens and to replace Nature with positive law as the source of political authority in this country. The source of natural sovereign political authority of the country is no longer the male State citizen father as it used to be recognized and protected in the Constitution for hundreds of years. Now it is the government, which means that the government has usurped Nature as the source of political authority in the country, proving that Obama and Magnus-Stinson have established a monarchy form of government. A ruling of dismissal by Judge Barker at this time would do the same thing to maintain the fraudulent monarchy form of government, thereby disenfranchising male State citizens from the recognition and protection of their natural sovereign political authority to be based upon the territory of the States of the union.

3) A summary dismissal at this time, based upon Rule 12b(6), would politicize the court and be a gross denial and violation of Guthrie's right of due process. This would permit foreign unconstitutional jurisdictions to intrude into the court with the effect to deny Guthrie and other natural born U.S. Citizens access to the courts and a fair hearing. This will create a foreign political jurisdiction inside the Article III Federal U.S. Courts. This foreign jurisdiction, as reflected by the handy work of Magnus-Stinson, renders political rulings that are asserted as precedent that deny recognition of Guthrie's natural born Citizen status to be derived from his State citizen father. This serves to prevent cases against a sitting non-President, and thus to prevent the protection of Guthrie's superior natural sovereign political right and authority being recognized and protected as the superior natural sovereign authority over the U.S. government, as recognized in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins,* 118 U.S. 356 (1886). It is the government which must obtain Guthrie's permission for its actions, as established in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins,* 118 U.S. 356 (1886), by the declaration in that case of the sovereign relationships in the United Sates between the People and their government, and supported by the rules in Law and Equity that require voluntary consent. The very presence of people like Magnus-Stinson in the federal court system represents a breakdown in the separation of powers doctrine between the three branches of government. Both the

Legislative branch and the Executive branch have fraudulently and unlawfully teamed up with one another to exceed their authority under the Constitution's Article II natural born Citizen Clause, in order to intrude a foreign political jurisdiction into the Judicial branch, thus politicizing the courts and making it impossible for the Judicial branch to prove that they have a valid proper claim of jurisdiction over a natural born Citizen plaintiff who files a lawsuit with the federal judiciary, and making it impossible for a natural born Citizen to get a fair and impartial hearing in his native government. If this precedent established by Magnus-Stinson is not corrected right now, over time it and similar court rulings over the last four years will lead to future non-natural born Citizen Presidents and the complete and total replacement of the de jure judges, thus eliminating the de jure jurisdiction of the Article III federal Courts, as well as any legitimate due process for natural born Citizens as defined under the de jure government of the Constitution of the United States of America, which is supposed to guarantee political appointments by a natural born Citizen of the United States, not natural born citizens of Kenya or some other foreign state.

4) A ruling for summary dismissal based upon Rule 12b(6) by the Court would perpetuate Magnus-Stinson's false definition of natural born Citizen, perpetuating an artificial man-made invented, frivolous, and naturally false definition of natural

born Citizen made by false precedents from Obama appointee judges. This false definition and the body of case law compiled over the last four years, is already in conflict with the U.S. Supreme Court rulings in *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001). There will be a conflict with *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), because in that case, the natural sovereign political right and sole authority to create citizens is recognized to be naturally vested solely with the male citizen. It will also create a conflict with *Yick Wo v. Hopkins,* 118 U.S. 356 (1886), because that case establishes the sovereign political authority and relationship between the People and their government to be such that the government is to serve the People who obtain their sovereign political authority from Nature, not from the government who obtains its artificial sovereign authority from the People, not from itself. Thus establishing the recognition in the Supreme Court that the source of political authority for the Office of President is Nature and the male citizens, not Magnus-Stinson or the Congress, or the President, courts, or even the voters. The de facto created definition of natural born Citizen which would result from a dismissal under Rule 12b(6) at this time would also create a definition that permits a conflict with the U.S. Constitution at Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; Article II, Section 1, Clause 5; and the First, the 5th, the 9th, and the 10th Amendments. This is because the declared definition of natural born Citizen by

the courts establishes a right for the government to create artificial sovereign political authority legal right privilege protections for the Office of President for the benefit of U.S. citizen females and their offspring made with foreign non-U.S. citizen males to unlawfully politically compete with the offspring of U.S. State citizen fathers by permitting the States to place non-qualified candidates for the Office of President on the ballot for a Presidential election. This is contrary to Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, and would permit the federal government to install and maintain a non-natural born Citizen in the Office of President, thus violating Article I, Section 9, Clause 8. By legal definition outlined in the Constitution and by the political laws of Nature these actions create a Title of Nobility under U.S. law. These acts would establish that U.S. citizen males who hail from one of the States of the United States do not have any recognition or protection of their natural sovereign political authority in the Constitution, nor that there is any protection provided for in the Constitution for a male State citizen's natural sovereign political right to be the sole source and authority and to be solely responsible for the creation and existence of natural born Citizens of the United States, who can be President.

5) A finding at this time that Guthrie's suit is frivolous and a summary dismissal upon that basis will establish that the government has the superior sovereign

political right to politically discriminate against male U.S. citizens and to ignore the political laws of Nature and facts in a lawsuit, and dispute facts in a lawsuit and facts of Nature with invented made-up fabrications of Nature and invented definitions of natural political reality which are made-up, frivolous, and false, and introduced by a judge as facts for the defendants in order to provide political cover for fraud and criminal acts of the defendants, and thereby subject U.S. natural sovereign authorities, i.e., natural born Citizens of the United States, to a claimed right by the government that the government is permitted by the Constitution of the United States of America and U.S. laws to subject natural born U.S. Citizens to a monarchy form of dictatorship government that is foreign to the nature of the native government established for natural born Citizens by the U.S. Constitution. The effect will be to establish a precedent and body of case law, established over the last four years and next four years, which can be used as a basis to forever shut the door to future claims by natural born Citizens against any U.S. government which installs and maintains non-natural born Citizens in the Office of President, which will then expose Guthrie and other natural born Citizens to being subject to a federal political dictatorship based upon any foreign non-citizen male from any country who is rich enough to buy the way into the Office of President for their offspring made with native U.S. female citizens, or by popularity of a candidate

who puts himself out for Office of President despite whether or not he is genuinely qualified as a candidate.

Introduction

6) Judge Barker has brought it to Guthrie's attention that de jure judges have ample authority to dismiss frivolous or transparently defective suits spontaneously. This is true if Judge Barker is talking about a suit brought in a proper de jure Article III court before a proper de jure judge who has been properly appointed and properly approved by the proper de jure government as defined by the Constitution of the United States of America, none of which the facts of this case support regarding Magnus-Stinson. Also, there must be a basis in material facts in evidence or a factual basis in applicable Law in evidence that can provide a basis for summary dismissal. No such evidence exists in material fact or Law (Natural Law) in Guthrie's case that can be used for a claim that Guthrie's case is frivolous. Below is the quote of the section from Judge Barker's Entry and Notice, dated 04/03/2013:

> "District judges have ample authority to dismiss frivolous or transparently defective suits spontaneously, and thus save everyone time and legal expense. This is so even when the plaintiff has paid all fees for filing and serviced." *Hoskins v. Poelstra*, 320 F.3d 761, 762

(7th Cir. 2003). This appears to be an appropriate cause in which to use authority.

Before delving into these issues, it is incumbent upon Guthrie at this point to bring it to the attention of the Court, that the position that Guthrie and Judge Barker now find themselves in, with Guthrie obliged to show cause at this time why Guthrie's suit is not a recycling of claims, and that Guthrie's suit is not frivolous, is procedurally improper at this point, as there are no facts in dispute at this time and no Law in dispute at this time. The reason we are even having this show cause is totally and wholly the result of the fraudulent misrepresentation and actions of the defendants. Particularly the fraudulent misrepresentation committed upon the Court by defendant de facto judge Magnus-Stinson, whose dishonorable actions has caused a violation of Guthrie's rights of due process in the previously filed case which left no lawful recourse for Guthrie other than to add Magnus-Stinson to this lawsuit due to her criminal actions of knowingly and intentionally operating under the false color of law in a conspiracy to maintain a foreign occupying government in the United States Article III federal courts and in the Office of President, even after being put on notice by the filing of Guthrie's suit before Magnus-Stinson that she was doing so. Therefore, Guthrie had no choice but to refile his case with the District Court in order to have a valid case adjudicated before a de jure government

and de jure judge at the District Court level, which could then be appealed to an Appeals Court jurisdiction, as that legitimate process has never yet occurred for Guthrie. The arguments and proof and evidence that Guthrie is now about to provide to the Court is not something that the Court should properly even be looking at in this way, at this time, as the Court and Judge Barker are now forced by the fraudulent, frivolous actions of the defendants into playing the role of an Appeals Court and judge, because under normal circumstances the appropriate course of action for Guthrie would have been to appeal Magnus-Stinson's ruling. However, due to the unique historical precedent of this case that creates foreign jurisdictional problem issues for an appeal if one has their case involuntarily assigned to an Obama appointee judge, and based upon the fraud and evidence provide by Magnus-Stinson as to why Guthrie's case was determined by her to be frivolous, it becomes apparent upon analysis that Guthrie did not have a suit adjudicated before his lawful de jure government, and what Magnus-Stinson has done in her summary judgment ruling that determined that Guthrie's case was frivolous and to be summarily dismissed, was that she did not actually determine that Guthrie's case was frivolous, she just lied and declared it to be so as a basis for her presumed authority under *Hoskins v. Poelstra* to summarily dismiss, in order to avoid dealing with the substance of Guthrie's complaint, doing this without any

evidence in the record in either material facts or applicable Law to base such a determination upon, and in order to provide political and financial and reputation protection cover for herself and Obama and the other named defendants. Magnus-Stinson knows that Obama cannot be a natural born Citizen without being the offspring of a U.S. citizen father, as pleaded in Guthrie's suit. She knows that if Guthrie gains standing in a federal court, then it will give the appearance of legitimacy to Guthrie and to Guthrie's explanations of the political Law of Nature which govern the definition and meaning of Article II natural born Citizen, which have never been heard in a U.S. court in the entire 224 years of our Nation's history. This would then lead to a public outcry and removal of Obama which could very well lead to Magnus-Stinson's embarrassment and removal from office and loss of her pay and her reputation might suffer, or worse, she might be prosecuted for treason, or misprision of felony, or misprision of treason for gross misconduct and gross dereliction of duty. Her actions before this current suit was filed were purely political and part of an ongoing bold and open criminal conspiracy and attempt at cover-up through maintaining the illusion that Obama is legitimate by forcefully maintaining him in Office against the Constitution and political Laws of Nature that are controlling. This is being done by taking advantage of people's legal and civic ignorance regarding the form of government

in the United States and ignorance of where rights come from and what natural political rights are. None of which is a basis to rely upon for Judge Barker to make a determination that Guthrie's case is frivolous, as to do so will convey a legitimacy upon de facto judge Magnus-Stinson and her actions that is not warranted, and will ensnare Judge Barker and the Court into the politics of the situation, and once again will cause the Court to rely upon political rulings and ignore the facts and law surrounding Guthrie's suit, facts and law which are at the heart of why this issue is even before the Judge Barker and the Court at this time.

7) If the Honorable Judge Barker wants to exercise authority under *Hoskins v. Poelstra* and Rule 12b(6), then Judge Barker will have to put away politics to suspend prior opinions for a moment and determine for herself anew, by reading Guthrie's filings and thinking for herself to actually objectively discover the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen. This discovery will be based upon material facts in evidence surrounding Obama's birth place and birth parents, and facts in evidence in Law, which includes applying both the controlling case law of *Minor v. Happersett,* 88 U.S. 162 (1875), and *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), and the superior pre-existing and controlling Natural Law or the Law of Nature, in order to discover for herself what a natural born Citizen is and whether or not Obama is one. Only then can it properly be determined if there is a factual basis

that supports a determination that Guthrie's case is frivolous and thus is to be summarily dismissed. This entire process did not occur within the foreign jurisdiction of de facto Jane Magnus-Stinson.

8) From Guthrie's point of view, the facts of this case and observations of natural reality show us that the current government of the United States, as it is currently occupied by the defendants, represents a government whose source of political authority for the head political leadership of the government is the male citizen fathers of Kenya. This is because Obama is the natural born offspring of a male Kenyan citizen father who was never a U.S. citizen. Therefore, when Guthrie's suit was involuntarily assigned to an Obama appointee who ruled upon Guthrie's complaint before Guthrie discovered that the judge was an Obama appointee, from Guthrie's point of view it was as if Guthrie's case had been transferred to an embassy of the foreign country of Kenya without his knowledge and permission, to be adjudicated by a Kenyan Judge. This is because the political source of authority for both Obama, and for Magnus-Stinson to claim jurisdiction over Guthrie's complaint, is not coming from the male U.S. citizen fathers from one of the States of the Union or their male or female citizen offspring. Nor is it coming from Guthrie by his filing his original suit as is the normal way in which a Court might obtain permission and thus personal jurisdiction to hear a case. The authority and

permission to hear the cases that are now assigned to Obama appointee judges, are coming from the male citizen fathers of Kenya and their offspring, which is contrary to the Constitution of the United States of America by Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; Article II, Section 1, Clause 5; and the First, the 5th, the 9th, and the 10th Amendments; which is also contrary to *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), that establishes the male U.S. citizen to be the source of United States natural sovereign political authority and voluntary political consent, and contrary, which is contrary to the sovereignty relationship between the People and the government described in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886),* and which is contrary to the Rules of Law and Equity which require voluntary consent. Guthrie was put into the position that his native government unlawfully transferred Guthrie's suit, without his knowledge or permission, to a foreign jurisdiction and foreign judge of Kenyan political authority who is a U.S. citizen who just happens to sit on the bench in the U.S. 7th District, assuming the de facto status of a U.S. federal judge. Then this voluntarily assumed U.S. citizen political Kenyan authority jurisdiction judge commits fraud and rules that Obama is a natural born Citizen by declaring him to be a sitting President that Guthrie cannot sue [see Jane Magnus-Stinson's entry of judgment and dismissal and justifications]. Guthrie agrees that one cannot sue a sitting President [see *Jones v.*

Clinton, 520 U.S. 681 (1997) exception in point 31 below], which is why he did not sue a sitting President. Guthrie made it clear in his complaint that he is suing a sitting non-President that Guthrie can sue because he is not a President, and that the only way for Guthrie to obtain recognition and protection of his political status and political rights is to sue the one responsible for the loss of those rights, who is also the one who is solely responsible for returning those rights to Guthrie by his removal from the Office that he holds without lawful authority. With or without lawful authority, defendant Obama is still one who is not exempt or immune from suit. Everyone just imagines him to be a President because he has forced his way via fraud and deception into the Office and maintains himself there with the help of the defendants, against the Constitution, because he is not a natural born Citizen, and he knows he is not one, as does Magnus-Stinson. Guthrie never presented his case as a case of suing a sitting President because that is impossible as Obama is a sitting non-President who everyone just alleges is a sitting President. It seems to Guthrie that this is because no one but Guthrie recognizes the basis of the U.S. Constitution or comprehends the legal political difference between a King and a President. It is only de facto judge Magnus-Stinson's deluded baseless subjective religious opinion that Obama is a President, based upon her religious opinion that the Constitution recognizes politically-adopted naturalized U.S. citizens who are

the offspring of foreign non-U.S. citizen male fathers to be, by definition, politically identical to politically non-adopted natural born Citizens who are the offspring of U.S. State citizen fathers, and that they both have all of the same political rights recognized in U.S. society. This is false because Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 clearly prohibits politically-adopted naturalized citizens from being President now that it is after the time of the Adoption of the Constitution. It is clear to Guthrie, and should be clear to anyone with any common sense who can read the Declaration of Independence and Constitution and who can appeal to the Laws of Nature (human reason and observation) regarding sexual reproduction among humans, that Obama is a sitting non-President usurper de facto monarch dictator due to the daily ongoing violations of Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article II, Section 1, Clause 5; and the First, the 5th, the 9th, and the 10th Amendments being committed by the Congress, and federal courts and federal police authorities who fraudulently maintain the public position that naturalized adopted U.S. citizens are definitionally synonymous and have all of the same political rights within U.S. society as Article II non-adopted natural born Citizens, which is false. Guthrie is then expected to accept this falsehood perpetrated by the defendants, the courts and by Magnus-Stinson via her false foreign jurisdictional ruling obtained without Guthrie's consent or knowledge. A falsehood which

declares that Article II natural born Citizen has absolutely nothing at all to do with the male U.S. citizens from the States and their offspring is a frivolous and malicious insult to Guthrie's intelligence. Apparently Guthrie is to attempt to return to his own country by filing an appeal, and hope and pray that his case is not again assigned to the foreign political jurisdictional authority of Kenya by being assigned to an Obama appointee, or that the court will not dismiss his appeal on the grounds that they do not hear appeals from the foreign political jurisdictions of the lower court judges of Kenya who are appointed by the offspring of Kenyan natives who were never U.S. citizens, just like Obama is the offspring of a non-U.S. citizen Kenyan father and has appointed Magnus-Stinson, just as if she was operating in the foreign jurisdiction of Kenya. This is not acceptable to Guthrie, who has not given his consent to this by the mere fact of his filing his previous suit, as Guthrie has a political right protected by the Article II natural born Citizen clause to have his case adjudicated before a judge who is appointed by a natural born Citizen like Guthrie. The Court has no authority whatsoever in U.S. law or under the Constitution, just like Magnus-Stinson had no right or authority, to force Guthrie to accept their purely religious and political rulings that he has had his case already adjudicated before a representative of his native government because Guthrie knows this to be a lie that has no basis in facts or Law. Therefore, Guthrie's native

constitutional government failed to secure proper jurisdiction over Guthrie himself, as well as Guthrie's previously filed lawsuit, and therefore the judgments and decisions that issued from Jane Magnus-Stinson were issued from a jurisdiction that is foreign and a non-controlling, and which never obtained consent from Guthrie or obtained proper native jurisdiction over Guthrie and his case. Thus Magnus Stinson's record is inadmissible for the determination that Guthrie's case is "frivolous" because the evidence works for Guthrie, not the government, and is admissible only for the prosecution of Guthrie's case. For Judge Barker to rely upon the record established by Magnus-Stinson to dismiss on Rule 12b(6) would be like reaching into a foreign jurisdiction, like Kenya, for example, for a Kenyan court ruling to base her decision regarding strictly United States internal issues, a ruling that was made not even based upon facts or Law in evidence but is just frivolous, malicious, invented, and obviously wrong. It has never before happened in the history of the United States of America that a non-natural born Citizen was elected to the Office of President, except under the exception made for those at the time of the Adoption of the Constitution, and now that this has happened, Guthrie and everyone else who files a challenge against Obama regarding his natural born Citizenship status are getting nothing but political rulings, not rulings based upon the facts or Law.

9) In order to exercise authority under *Hoskins v. Poelstra* and summarily dismiss Guthrie's case the prerequisite would be that a judge would have to discover there to be a material fact in evidence or a basis in U.S. Law or in Natural Law in evidence which could provide a source of authority as a basis for one's determination that a case is frivolous or not stating a claim. Thus by contradictory material facts in evidence, or by contradictory applicable rules of Law in evidence, there would be no basis for an injury or remedy, or authority for the court to adjudicate Guthrie's case, and thus no standing, which would then warrant a summary dismissal under the authority of *Hoskins v. Poelstra* based upon lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

10) Magnus-Stinson did not have any material facts surrounding the details of Obama's birth in her possession which could possibly be a basis for her to dispute Guthrie's pleadings that Obama was born in Hawaii to a U.S. citizen mother and foreign non-U.S. citizen father who was a citizen of Kenya, nor did she have any evidence that Obama is the offspring of a State citizen father who is a United States citizen. The defendants in the case that was before Magnus-Stinson never even received Guthrie's complaint because Magnus-Stinson prevented the case from being distributed, thus they never responded with any evidence put into the record that disputes the facts of Obama's birth history, place of birth, and birth

parents, which Guthrie learned directly from Obama himself through his personally-approved published biographies. How in the world does Magnus-Stinson know that the facts are in dispute, if she has not heard from the defendants regarding Obama's birth details, and she obviously has no facts of her own that are contradictory? How does Magnus-Stinson or Judge Barker know that the defendants will not agree with Guthrie's stated facts of Obama's birth details and Law of Nature definition, since neither has ever heard from the defendants? Why would there be any dispute in the facts regarding Obama's birth place and birth parents given that Guthrie only presented the already well-known and accepted common knowledge truth that everyone on the entire planet Earth has known for over four years from Mr. Obama, the official government news releases and the previous Court findings over the last four years that Obama was born in Hawaii to a U.S. citizen mother and foreign non-citizen father from Kenya. This is common knowledge. If Magnus-Stinson has secret evidence that she is withholding from the Court, Guthrie and Judge Barker, evidence that Obama really is not the offspring of a foreign non-U.S. citizen male from Kenya, and is actually the offspring of a U.S. State citizen father, she needs to immediately provide this evidence to Guthrie, to the Court and to Judge Barker so that Guthrie will not look like a fool and be wasting everyone's time with a frivolous suit. If this suit is

frivolous, it is only because Magnus-Stinson and the defendants are withholding evidence from the Court or lying, not because Guthrie has not established a factual and legal basis for an injury, claim, and remedy. Judge Barker can very easily determine for herself whether or not Guthrie is stating a valid claim, but it requires her to put away all the false decisions and appearances being created by those with a political agenda other than securing political liberty and political justice for Guthrie, and to appeal to superior Natural Law in order to discover the veracity of Guthrie's claims.

11) This case is unique in the history of the United States in the regard that there is nothing besides the political history of the United States and how it was formed from a monarchy in England, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Law of Nature or Natural Law for a judge to rely upon in order to determine the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen in Article II, and to thus determine who qualifies for the Office of President and whether or not Guthrie's case is frivolous. It is legally and physically impossible to determine whether or not Guthrie's case is frivolous, and thus subject to summary dismissal, without first discovering and knowing the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen because the entire basis for standing, and thus whether or not the suit is "frivolous", depends upon knowing and proving the definition of natural born

Citizen. Furthermore, one cannot discover the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen by relying solely upon Guthrie, or upon any case law, nor upon Magnus-Stinson as she has already proven, by what appears to be her judgment of summary dismissal, that she does not comprehend what a natural born Citizen is, or if she does then she does not seem to care. The Court cannot rely upon these sources because the nature of the body of Law that is defining and controlling upon the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen is not something that one can just read in a declaration and accept. It is something to which one must apply one's mind, think deeply about, and verify with logic and the absence of applicable contradictory evidence in order to "discover" the Law of Nature for oneself and become convinced. Guthrie cannot force knowledge into Judge Barker's head. Guthrie can only teach Judge Barker how to ask the right questions that pertain to her personally in order to objectively discover for herself what the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen is, just as Guthrie had to ask himself to discover for himself. Guthrie cannot force the Court to accept that the planets revolve around the Sun and not the Sun around the planets [Galileo Syndrome]. Guthrie had to discover this for himself also. People told Guthrie that it was the case that the planets revolve around the Sun --just like people keep telling Guthrie that Obama is a President or the President-- but it was not until Guthrie went to Purdue

University and obtained a degree in Applied Physics and Mathematics, learned about the Law of Gravity and Mathematics (Laws of Nature), and then bought a telescope (observation of facts in evidence in Nature) and applied the Law of Nature to the observed facts in Nature, that he was then able to actually verify this heliocentric nature of our solar system for himself and to accept that it was not all just hearsay. The same is true regarding Obama's ineligibility. It is all just hearsay that he is eligible. It is all just hearsay that he is a President or the President based upon the illusion that is created by his occupation of the Office, and by the illusion created by fraudulent frivolous, false, and malicious definitional decrees from the three branches of government, news media, and society, which lead one to believe that he is serving the public as a Constitutional representative, which he most definitely is not. In order for Judge Barker to discover for herself the Natural Law definition of natural born Citizen, it requires Judge Barker to put away hearsay evidence to assume the role of an investigative scientist and to do a mental exercise wherein she asks some questions regarding the difference between natural rights and legal rights and asks herself what are political rights and where do they come from, and in which category do they fall, natural rights or legal rights, in order for her to discover that Guthrie is not crazy and that his suit has merit, and that he is frivolous claims or that his suit represents a recycling of claims. In order to know

the definition and meaning of Article II natural born Citizen it requires one to appeal solely to Natural Law and ask oneself some personal questions regarding who creates you, where do your political rights come from and what is their nature in U.S. society. This includes distinguishing natural rights which are considered endowed according to Natural Laws, from legal rights which are only *bestowed* privileges that are artificially created from the three branches of government. What is meant by Natural Law?

Part I

The objective proof of the discovery that males are the only ones, in any given political society (country) that is not a monarchy form of government, who are physically and politically responsible for the creation of natural born citizens, and females do not have or possess the natural right to create natural born citizens. Females only possess a natural right to create offspring (not natural born citizens), a natural right to choose from which country to create a natural born citizen, and a legal right protection to create naturalized citizens.

12) Natural Law is, by definition, the Law of Nature that is discoverable by the five human senses and by the reasoning faculties of the mind alone. Therefore, if Guthrie is correct and he has not filed a frivolous suit, then this can easily be proven and discovered by Judge Barker simply through examining the political and physical Laws of Nature as they pertain to the sexual reproduction of male and female humans living under non-monarchy forms of government, and then by

extracting the knowledge and applying it to the jurisdiction of the Court. Under non-monarchy forms of government, like is supposed to be guaranteed in the Constitution by Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; Article II, Section 1; Clause 5; and the First, the 5th, the 9th, and 10th Amendments, it is only possible for one to be born as a native of the country, or synonymously a natural born citizen, of one country at birth, not multiple countries at birth. Even though a person may have multiple citizenships, such a person can only have one native country that the person is from at one time, which starts out as the native citizenship or the country in which the person is a natural born citizen. This country might cange over time if that person emigrates and adopts another country as that person's native country. Only under monarchy forms of government can there be persons born who can rise to the head political leadership position of multiple countries simultaneously. This is due to a *legal right* privilege guaranteed at birth due to a *Title of Nobility* [like the Queen of the United Kingdom, for example, who politically rules over multiple countries]. Under monarchy forms of government, the political order or law is not based upon a natural order from Nature and Her laws [i.e., from being the offspring of citizen parents of a country as is stated in *Minor v. Happersett,* 88 U.S. 162 (1875)] but instead is based upon an artificial created man-made political legal privilege that

permits the mere declaration of native citizenship, whether or not the offspring has a natural right claim as a native of some other county, just like what Jane Magnus-Stinson did for Obama in dismissing Guthrie's suit as frivolous. In doing so she declared Obama to be a sitting President, and thus defining a natural born Citizen or native as contrary to the facts in evidence, contrary to the controlling Law in evidence, which is Natural Law and the Constitution, and contrary to any authority granted to her because it is not under the jurisdiction of the three branches of government to define natural born Citizen without a constitutional Amendment. The mere pronouncement of natural born Citizen status, as Jane-Magnus-Stinson has done in her summary dismissal, and would occur again if Judge Barker summarily dismisses under Rule 12b(6), defines natural born Citizen without jurisdiction and authority, and defines it wrongly I might add, creating a U.S. citizen offspring who can claim to be a natural born citizen of two countries, in one instance a natural born Citizen of the U.S. via the baseless created pronouncement by the U.S. courts over the last four years and by Magnus-Stinson, and in the other instance a natural born citizen of Kenya via the father by Natural Law political right claim. Magnus-Stinson and Congress have created a Title of Nobility for Obama in violation of Article I, Section 9, Clause 8, and by ignoring the facts in evidence and the controlling Law in evidence. Such is contrary to the Law of

Nature that determines that one is only born a native of one country at birth, not two, unless we are under a monarchy form of government. This one country that one is a native of, or is "from", is determined by the paternal parent's citizenship, due to the operation of the political and physical Laws of Nature that automatically govern these matters in non-monarchy forms of government [see points 14 and 15 below]. *Minor v. Happersett,* 88 U.S. 162 (1875) clearly shows us that a natural born Citizen is not something that is created by government via declarations and pronouncements or invented definitions, or is even a function of Positive Law at all or a function of the three branches of government, but is actually something that is just a naturally factual result of sexual reproduction among human beings and is thus already defined by the operation of certain political and physical laws in Nature which already naturally govern human reproduction and the creation of natural born Citizens of the United States and natural born citizens of other countries. One need only start with the declaration by the Chief Justice in the *Minor* case:

> "...it was never doubted that all children born in a country of parents who were its citizens became themselves, upon their birth, citizens also. These were natives, or natural-born citizens, as distinguished from aliens or foreigners."

13) There are three possible elements related above in the declaration of what a natural born Citizen is. However, this declaration is in no way complete or thorough because the *Minor* Court did not investigate far enough into what is defining upon natural born citizen: the place of birth, the mother, or the father? If they had, they would not have made the error of determining that the prohibitions at the State level which prevented female citizens from voting were not a violation of the Constitution, a determination which is clearly wrong in light of Guthrie's discovery, because both males and females are natural born Citizens and thus both can be President according to the Constitution, as there is no evidence that the intent of the Framers was to prevent females from that Office or to discriminate against females politically. Therefore it is impossible for a female natural born Citizen to have this recognized and protected natural political right to be President declared in the Constitution in Article II, the natural right to be the chief or head political leader of the country, yet not have a recognized and protected natural right to vote recognized in the Constitution prior to the 19th Amendment because the natural right to vote is just the natural right to give one's political permission to be represented, which is just the voluntary giving of a natural sovereign political right of consent, which is an essential and necessary natural right element that is required to be recognized and protected in order for a person to be able to even

exercise the duties of the Office of President. Therefore, if the Constitution does not make distinctions between male and female natural born Citizens who obviously can both be President, and it doesn't, and both must inherit equal natural political rights from their citizen father, the same political rights within the society that the father has, governed only by the natural limits imposed by the political Law of Nature that governs natural political differences between males and females, then it is impossible for one to say that the Constitution did not recognize or protect a female citizen's right to vote prior to the 19th Amendment because it does recognize and protect the right via the Article II definition of natural born Citizen and via the Equal Protection Clauses, and the States voluntarily agreed and adopted the Constitution. Therefore, Guthrie fails to see how the States could claim a superior sovereign right or any authority whatsoever to deny a State citizen female her ability to freely exercise her natural right to vote, the same as other male citizens. Ignorance of the law is no excuse. I think that the intention of Jefferson and company who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the 10 Amendments was to secure Liberty, including political liberty, and justice for all, not just secure political liberty for males. I just think that there existed male chauvinism in the society, so everyone else was not as politically enlightened as Jefferson and company, and thus they misinterpreted the

Constitution to suit their political beliefs. In exactly this same way, with the gender table being turned, Magnus-Stinson has committed sex-based political rights discrimination against a male, Guthrie, by misinterpreting the Constitution as giving her authority to rule his case to be frivolous by declaring the definition of a U.S. President to be defined without the male citizen father being involved in the definition, in order for Magnus-Stinson to suit her personal political beliefs and opinions which are necessary in order to keep her and Obama in their positions of power and authority. From Guthrie's point of view, the Court in the *Minor* case failed to find the obvious authority in the Constitution which must be determined solely by appealing to the political Law of Nature, which is what the Framers of the Constitution appealed to in order to establish the basis of political equality and justice within the society. The *Minor* case clearly shows that the court never bothered to determine who or what the source of the voting rights for male and female citizens is, because in order to determine that, they would have had to determine what was defining upon natural born Citizen --the place of birth, the mother, or the father-- and they did not do that. Thus, female U.S. citizens were handed a male chauvinistic political interpretation that caused females to suffer many more decades of injustice, a situation that necessitated a 19th Amendment protection that should have never been needed. Guthrie and male natural born

Citizens are now in the same danger. If Magnus-Stinson's judgment of frivolous and dismissal is permitted, then an institutionalized government sex-based discrimination upon the determination of the definition of natural born Citizen will be established that permits the government to exclude male State citizen fathers from the definition, i.e., the entire previously recognized and protected political class of natural sovereign male State citizens and their male and female offspring, which the previously discovered, understood and recognized Natural Law definition of natural born Citizen, codified into Article II, Section 1, Clause 5, was created and meant to secure. An entire previously-recognized natural sovereign political class composed of the male State citizens will be politically disenfranchised from their own native government as it is defined under the Constitution of the United States of America, and so too will the male and female progeny of those male State citizen fathers, for whom the natural born Citizen Clause and Constitution were written. If this dismissal is upheld by the Supreme Court, then this sex-based disenfranchisement of the political rights of the People based upon the discrimination against male fathers from the States and their offspring who are both citizens of the United States will then necessitate a Constitutional Amendment, just as the female citizens had to obtain as a result of the flawed *Minor* court case decision. This will be necessary in order to declare

that only the offspring of male State citizen fathers who are citizens of the United States can be President, in order to re-establish the purpose and intent of Article II natural born Citizen Clause and to re-secure the recognition and protection of the natural political rights of the males in the society that come from the States. These rights have been unlawfully and fraudulently taken away by Obama, Magnus-Stinson, the Congress, the courts, the voters, the Electors, and by the Secretaries of State of the 50 States.

14) Now, look at each element of natural born citizen separately in the quote of the Chief Justice in point 12 above. The soil jurisdiction or place of birth has absolutely nothing at all to do with the inheritance or endowment of natural political rights. The only way the soil or place of birth could ever be a factor in natural born citizenship and the transference of natural political rights would be if males reproduced humans by casting their seed on the ground and nine months later harvesting a natural born citizen like a plant from the soil or a potato from the ground. Only then could one argue that the state or federal government has any role in defining what a natural born Citizen is, and that the political rights that are passed on at birth come from the government that has jurisdiction over the soil territory of the state. Only then would it be proper to argue that the three branches of government are free to define natural born citizenship to be those native plant

humans who are sprung out of and harvested from the native soil (place of birth) that is governed by the political country that claims territorial jurisdiction over that soil. In this situation any male who spills his seed on U.S. soil territory jurisdiction, regardless of his citizenship, would be producing natural born Citizens of the United States. Because Judge Barker is a very intelligent woman who is a mother and knows quite well that natural born Citizen offspring are not grown out of the ground, we can safely say that we have eliminated the soil or place of birth as having anything at all to do with natural born citizenship, and also that the three branches of government have not yet obtained any jurisdiction to define what is a natural born Citizen because it has nothing to do with the place of birth. So there is nothing for the three branches to adjudicate that falls under the state's jurisdiction, as we are not under the jurisdiction of the three branches. Although we have yet to discover who is the source of authority for the permission to create natural born Citizens, and we have just ruled out the state with regard to place of birth. Therefore, we have discovered that the place of birth is irrelevant in determining the political authority to create natural born Citizens. Thus the place of birth in record or not in record makes no difference and cannot possibly be a basis for a determination that the case is frivolous, as the place of birth is just where you are born, not where you are politically from. (Guthrie, by the way, is a

natural born Citizen who was born to U.S. parents in Japan.) It makes no difference whether Obama was born in Hawaii, Kenya, or Mars. So now we have eliminated one element of the three. We are down to what is defining upon natural born Citizen, and it is the citizen parents. Judge Barker is a mother who has given birth to natural born citizen offspring. Note the lower case 'citizen', thus general noun usage, as Guthrie does not know if the father of Judge Barker's children was a U.S. citizen from a State of the union. If the father was a U.S. citizen, then Guthrie could say that Judge Barker has given birth to natural born Citizen offspring, meaning a natural born citizen that can be President of the United States, and not just a description of anyone on Earth who is the offspring of a male citizen from someplace who has a natural right claim to be the head political leader of his or her father's country. In other words, a "natural born citizen", is a natural right claim of all politically free natural born citizens (male and female citizens) from any country that is politically free and not a monarchy. This is because in monarchies, there are only involuntary natural born citizen 'subjects' at birth who don't necessarily have a recognized natural right to be the head political leader of the country, showing us why natural born Citizen is not defined under English Common Law by soil territory dominion of the state (king), and its usage and meaning is unique to the U.S. Constitution and distinguishes our form of

government from the one under King George III. Judge Barker can just ask herself this question:

> Which of the parents, mother or father, has both the sole political authority to create a natural born Citizen, and also the sole responsibility for causing woman to become pregnant?

The honest answer to the above question will prove conclusively and objectively that Guthrie's case is not frivolous and that he is not recycling claims. The answer is a self-evident objective verification of the veracity and substance of Guthrie's case that is independent of Guthrie or the Court, which Judge Barker can see for herself and cannot properly deny, and proves conclusively that there is massive fraud and political cover-up going on for over four years now, and that Judge Barker cannot rely upon the fact of Magnus-Stinson's actions, rulings or findings because there is nothing within her judgments, rulings, or findings of any substance to discover. Both the record itself and the details contained within have no substance for the government's side. They all work for Guthrie as evidence that makes Guthrie's case, not a case for summary dismissal.

15) A female human U.S. citizen is not a hermaphrodite capable of impregnating herself with her own sperm, nor can she rape a man and force him to get her pregnant without his permission and voluntary cooperation. Obviously if a female wants to take the political step and create a natural born citizen offspring of some country, then she is going to have to obtain the permission of some male of some society. Because males in non-monarchy forms of government are politically bound by their membership in their own native political country to only be able to make natural born citizens of their own political society of which they are already citizens, and only by their own voluntary consent and permission, simple natural logic and natural reason dictates that the sole political authority and permission to create a natural born citizen of any particular political country is vested as a function of the political Law of Nature to be with the males, *not with the females. The female is dependent upon the male both for permission to create a natural born citizen of any particular society through being naturally required to obtain the male's consent to create a natural born citizen, and also physically dependent upon the male to create a child offspring by making the female pregnant, which only a male can accomplish and only by his own voluntary will and authority, with or without the female's consent.*

16) Thus we have now eliminated the state as being the source of authority that creates or defines natural born Citizen, proving that it is not even under Magnus-Stinson's or the Court's jurisdiction or authority to define and declare Obama to be a President based upon his place of birth in Hawaii, that is in the record, and to use that as a basis for a determination that Guthrie's case is frivolous. What constitutes a President is already defined by the superior and controlling jurisdictions of Nature and Her Laws, and by the Constitution in Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; Article II, Section 1, Clause 5; and by the First, 5th, 9th, and 10th Amendments, and it has absolutely nothing at all to do with the place of birth. We have also eliminated the female as being a factor in the inheritance of natural political rights, because we have just proven and discovered objectively in point 15, via applying reason alone and the Law of Nature and observation, that the sole source of natural sovereign political rights and authority in any non-monarchal country, including the United States of America, are the males. It is the male who must give his permission for the creation of a natural born citizen native of his country. He can only speak politically for his own country, and he alone must impregnate the female to make it happen. Thus, he is solely responsible for the creation of such an offspring, bound to the country that the male father chooses to be his country. This is why people like Guthrie are called *Patriots*, derived from

the Latin or Greek word for *father*, and not *Matriot* which would be derived from the word for *mother*. It is the citizen father who politically and physically creates one to be a natural born citizen of his native country by his own will, and thus the natural political rights within the society are endowed via the citizen father to the male and female offspring, equally as far as Nature permits things to be politically equal between the sexes, such as the natural right to vote or the natural right to hold the Office of President, for example. This being just the natural political right to be the chief or head political leader of a free non-monarchal society, a natural political right which both males and females can claim in their father's native society, especially if they are natural born Citizens of the United States of America, because our Constitution recognizes male and female citizens to both be natural born Citizens by the Law of Nature alone, and only natural born Citizens can be President according to Article II, Section 1, Clause 5, thus defining a President as the male or female offspring who is a U.S. citizen who comes from a State citizen father. Clearly the term natural born Citizen was already well-defined and understood by the Framers long before Obama or Magnus-Stinson came onto the scene, and it does not mean that Obama is a President. Therefore the basis of the previous "frivolous" determination is groundless in the extreme and there is no basis in the record at this time for a similar determination, unless the Court has

evidence that Obama is the offspring of a male citizen of the United States who comes from a State, in which case they must produce such evidence so that Guthrie can go away peaceably.

17) Not only have we discovered the sole political source of authority for the creation of natural born Citizens of the United States to be the males and not females or the state, but we have seen that this is in no way an inequity or unfairness to females, and in no way does it deny a female political equality within society, nor does it relegate females to second class citizenship. In fact, under the U.S. Constitution's Article II natural born Citizen Clause, and due to the Title of Nobility prohibitions and the Equal Protection Clauses, the discovered natural definition of natural born Citizen defines and protects political equality between male and female citizens in the society as equal natural born Citizens. This is notwithstanding the erroneous ruling in *Minor* that denied the right to vote to women. Guthrie agrees with the Court in *Minor v. Happersett,* 88 U.S. 162 (1875), except its final determination regarding the females' obviously declared and secured natural right to vote that is in Article II via the natural born Citizenship definition as it exists in Nature and is defined equally by the political Law of Nature to be the same for both males and females. That court's bad decision made it necessary for a Constitutional Amendment, the 19th Amendment, which should

have never had to happen. Therefore females unfortunately suffered for many more decades, but Guthrie sees no evidence that the intention of either the Founders or the *Minor* court was to prevent political equality, and sees that both males and females are politically equal natural born Citizens by the Law of Nature alone. Obviously though, it is just a natural political fact of Nature, which is just the result of human sexual reproductive laws, that the male citizens are inextricably linked to the definition of Article II natural born Citizen, as it is the male who must give his permission and do the deed in order to create a natural born Citizen. This is reflected in U.S. Law and verified by the Supreme Court case of *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), which found that the male U.S. citizen is naturally politically different than the female U.S. citizen with regard to how the state claims jurisdiction over the offspring for the recognition and securing of citizenship. The findings in *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001) show us that the sole authority and responsibility rests upon the male U.S. citizen, not the female U.S. citizen, because the male U.S. citizen father must claim his offspring within 18 years and report the fact of the birth to the authorities, whereas for female U.S. citizens, they do not have to claim their offspring and they do not have to make a reporting. This is consistent with our discovery above in 15 and 16 that shows that female citizens do not have the natural political right to create natural born Citizens because it is not

up to them. It is up to the male citizen who must give his consent first and also must do the deed of making the female pregnant by his own will and voluntary actions. Because females do not confer natural born citizenship, the state must extend its jurisdiction automatically [by birth certificate] and provide for the female mother and her offspring made with a foreign father because the mother cannot make the political decision for herself to create natural born Citizens. She can only make the political decision for her to make offspring. This is a reason why rape is recognized to be a crime. This is meant to protect the mother's natural right choice to create offspring. The female can make the political decision to choose to which country her children will be natural born citizens, by her choice of the male sex partner father who possesses citizenship in some country. Thus she can make the political decision to create an adopted naturalized "citizen of the United States" who is not the offspring of a State citizen father, but she cannot make the political decision to create a natural born Citizen, because in order to do that she must seek permission from a male, where the male's citizenship is a factor in the determination of the U.S. natural born citizenship status of the offspring. Given this, it is not up to the female or under her natural ability to create natural born Citizens of the United States by her own will and authority alone, and she must seek the consent (political permission) and become pregnant by a male U.S.

citizen who is solely responsible for giving his consent and making her pregnant. This is because no one can do the deed for him but himself according to the Law of Nature. If the Court does not know what a natural born Citizen means, it cannot know its authority because it does not know the source of its authority. Not only did Magnus-Stinson lack jurisdiction in the case that she hijacked because her authority derives from the fathers of Kenya, but she cannot declare Obama to be President without knowledge of the source of such authority, of which she remains ignorant.

18) However, for the male, no such automatic authority of the state to extend their jurisdiction exists and the state must wait for the father to act. His jurisdiction is recognized in *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), to be a superior and pre-existing authority to that of the state. Because the State citizen father is the one who makes the political decision to create a natural born Citizen and he must claim the offspring and invoke state jurisdiction in order to secure the recognition of the passage of his natural political rights within U.S. society onto his offspring, which he created by no other political authority other than his own. Guthrie does not believe, based upon its majority opinion and reasoning, that the *Nguyen* Court understood why their analysis turned up the way it did. By looking at case law history regarding citizenship cases, the Court discovered a common denominator,

which indicating to them that the state waits 18 years for the father to claim the offspring and report the offspring, but does not wait or require this for the female U.S. citizen mother. The Court did not understand why this requirement exists. It exists as a natural result through history of the invisible hand of the political Law of Nature, the one that is at the heart of the Declaration of Independence and codified into Article II natural born Citizen Clause, which has been at work in cases over the centuries and which has actually established political equality between males and females as equal natural born Citizens, as far as voting rights and the right to be President, according to Natural Law, as defined by the political Law of Nature. At one time in our Nation's history, the concepts being related here were common knowledge among judges and legal scholars, and can still be read about in law dictionaries and legal textbooks from before the Civil War. No Amendment to the Constitution since those times has changed any of these concepts being related. They are all still valid concepts of Law in the United States and are supposed to still be in effect, unless we are just not a Nation ruled by Law anymore. To find out what it means to live in America and to call oneself an American natural born Citizen is why Guthrie had to bring this suit. It is because of gross incompetence and extreme dereliction of duty (if not also corruption) that the U.S. government and the defendants in this case do not know the meaning and

source of natural born Citizen. A ruling to dismiss Guthrie's suit as frivolous in light of the evidence of the last few paragraphs would fraudulently create a de facto definition of natural born Citizen that eliminates the U.S. citizen male father and his offspring from the equation, that trumps hundreds of years of precedent, and that creates a definition that is at odds with the findings in *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), which stands for the law that it is the male U.S. citizen father who is the sole political authority of the country who creates natural born Citizens.

19) The American Declaration of Independence states that it is a self-evident truth of Nature that Liberty, which includes political liberty or freedom from dictatorship, is an unalienable (natural) political right that is endowed to one from "their Creator". This does not mean "God", or the passage would read endowed from the Creator, not their Creator. By stating that Liberty is a natural political right that is endowed to one by their Creator, this makes it personal and requires the reader to apply the necessary thinking skills in order to discover the context for oneself, of who politically creates you and where your political rights come from, in order that the self-evident truths being described can be seen as true and factual and to make sense. That is what we did in points 15 through 18 above, and objectively discovered, by examining the natural political and physical laws of Nature which govern who gives the permission and is responsible for the

pregnancy that leads to a natural born Citizen, showing conclusively that Guthrie's suit has merit and is not frivolous. As a result of the self-evident and logical proof that is in Part I above, we can see that Guthrie has not made up or originated anything, and nothing he has said so far regarding the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen is wrong according to Nature and Her laws, nor can he be proven to be incorrect with any facts in the record or facts in Law which could cause a rational person to dispute Guthrie's pleadings (facts and Law including Natural Law) and thus determine that his suit is frivolous. In light of Guthrie's related discovery that only male citizens are responsible for the creation of natural born Citizens, we can now shed light upon the Declaration of Independence and discover more supporting evidence that helps to prove that Guthrie's suit is not frivolous. From the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence:

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,...." [Underline emphasis added of the nouns men and Men]

An important thing to notice in the above passage from the Declaration of Independence is the use of capitalization. Throughout the Declaration, the pattern of capitalization of the nouns seems to follow the grammatical rules for general and specific nouns. Thus when nouns are not capitalized, the contextual meaning is to interpret the noun as a generic or general noun, as in the first usage of the word 'men' which is declaring that the natural sovereign political authority of Nature, with regard to natural political rights (Liberty), resides equally with both males and females, because the context of the document, paragraph, and sentence, and the lower-case 'men', indicates that 'men' is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense to mean *all mankind* which includes both males and females. However conversely, when the noun is capitalized, the intent seems to follow the rule that some specific, limited, instance or thing is being indicated and is not a broad usage. For example, the very next sentence declares the self-evident truth that, when it comes to <u>securing</u> these natural political rights, governments are instituted among 'Men', now meaning specifically <u>males</u> and not females. Again, this is being declared as a self-evident truth of Nature or Natural Law, so the veracity of the statement can be independently and objectively determined by anyone for themselves, by just thinking about it with logic and reason and making

observations of how things work in the real world. This is because Natural Law is the law that is discoverable by reason and the five senses alone. When it comes to securing the natural right of Liberty, Jefferson writes, governments are created by the males – not the females. Because the male is the physically stronger of the two sexes, the society expects this of the males. Jefferson is *not* being a male chauvinist pig saying that government is a male-only club nor saying that females do not possess the natural right, and thus don't have the capacity, to create a government on their own. Instead, he was just describing a truism of Nature, an observed natural order or Law. Because the subject matter jurisdiction that is controlling our investigation as to whether or not Guthrie's suit is frivolous or is a recycling of claims is fully under Natural Law, we can simply think about how societies naturally organize and structure themselves into governments by examining the social dynamics between males and females and offspring to discover evidence in history and in U.S. law and practices which shows us that it is indeed due to the physical strength advantage that a male naturally possesses which causes society, especially the females and children offspring of minor age, to place an expectation upon the male adult members of the society to form a government for the protection of the society, both for physical safety and to protect rights.

20) Here is a passage from Emmerich de Vattel: The Law of Nations, or The Principles of the Law of Nature applied to Nations and Sovereigns; Book 1, Chapter 19, Section 212:

> §212. Citizens and natives. The citizens are the members of the civil society: bound to this society by certain duties, and subject to its authority, they equally participate in its advantages. **The natives, or natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens**. As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those **children naturally follow the condition of their fathers**, and **succeed to all their rights**. The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, reserves to **his children** the right of becoming members of it. **The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children**; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent. We shall soon see, whether, on their coming to the years of discretion, they may renounce their right, and what they owe to the society in which they were born. **I say, that, in order to be of the country, it is necessary that a person be born of a father who is a citizen;** for if he is born there of a foreigner, it will be only the place of his birth, and not his country. [*Emphasis added*]

For our purposes I would ask the Court to focus upon this part of the passage:

> As the society cannot exist and perpetuate itself otherwise than by the children of the citizens, those **children naturally follow the condition of their fathers**, and **succeed to all their rights**. The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation; and it is presumed, as matter of course, that each citizen, on entering into society, reserves to **his children** the right of becoming members of it. **The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children**;

and particularly:

> The society is supposed to desire this, in consequence of what it owes to its own preservation;

What Mr. Vattel is relating here in Section 212 of his book explaining Natural Law or the political Law of Nature as applied to sovereign authorities, such as nations or individuals ('sovereigns' as Vattel calls them), is that in order for any society to survive, it must have a new and perpetual source of citizens, and it must have a way to defend itself from hostile forces from outside of the society or even from within the society which threaten the society. It is being declared that the society itself desires that it be the males who serve in this role as the recognized natural political perpetual source of the citizens and to protect and preserve the society, because the society realizes that it is the males whom Nature endows with the natural political authority to create citizen offspring of a government only by their own consent, a government of the male fathers own choosing or creation, and he is also the one that Nature endows and best equips physically to combat with the physical threats to the society. One can imagine a primitive setting in ancient times, or perhaps a Native American Indian tribe before the arrival of the British and the Europeans, and just think about the social dynamics, to see how this

natural order arises. How does a primitive hunter-gather tribe operate? Typically we observe that the males are territorial creatures by nature, similar to lions in that male humans will stake out a territory for hunting and gathering purposes of survival and defend that territory from other foreign males. When a tribe settles in an area, the males establish borders and territories and will defend them from animals and foreign hostile males so that their female folk and children will be safe and protected. If an outside threat attacks an encampment, for example, the adult males grab their weapons and move to intercept the intruders while the females and children move away from the threat. From this example of a society without written laws, we can see that in order to protect the society, the males must establish territorial boundaries and defend them and their females and offspring, and this naturally requires rules and regulations to be imposed upon the females and children of the tribe, in order to aid and assist the male adults in their expected role to defend the society and protect everyone's rights. Who is going to enforce these rules, the females? I would imagine they already have enough to do with taking care of the offspring and taking care of themselves and their husbands. Even though it was only common custom and not written law, tribes established government. It was naturally created by the males because the society wants the male to create the government. He is naturally territorial and is naturally the

protector and enforcer due to his natural superiority in physical strength. The duty just naturally falls upon the male, and the society of females and children naturally desire this. It is the natural basis in Nature (Natural Law) of how we get to Jefferson's declaration that "to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men", meaning males. If you think about it, one would be hard-pressed to find an example that exists in Nature throughout history where a political force of females defeated all-male rivals in combat and claimed a defended territory and set about establishing and enforcing rules and regulations for the safety and protection of their males and the male's offspring. It is kind of a funny notion, not that it could not happen mind you. We can still see this concept in play as a natural order in the United States by examining the laws that require adult male citizens to register for the military draft but female citizens are not required to register. This is because the society places the political expectation upon the males to defend and protect the society, not upon the females. The females are certainly capable of defending the society militarily, but for them it is entirely a choice, a personal political decision and not a political expectation that society places upon them. At least this has been a recognized natural order in all countries throughout world history. The one exception being the modern State of Israel, which requires its

females to register and give compulsory military service; however, this is a relatively modern occurrence in history.

21) To be a member of the Tribe of Israel, a religious political society and not a state political society, it requires being born to a Jewish mother, and *both the place of birth and the father's citizenship are irrelevant.* This follows Guthrie's earlier evidence in Part I above that proves that a female has a natural political right to create offspring who will naturally be members of the family of mankind but not necessarily a 'citizen' of some state political society (country), because her offspring do not have a natural political right to claim membership in any state political society based upon the mother. This is because females cannot politically create natural born citizens by their own permission and authority alone, as we discovered earlier in Part I at point 15. Judaism is a religious membership according to Jewish people, which has absolutely nothing at all to do with political rights that come from the state, which can only be from males because only males can create natural born citizens by their own authority alone without state authority and permission needed, and you are not a 'citizen' and don't need to be a 'citizen' to be Jewish, as it is not even a function of state political authority that is naturally vested in males. Thus the Tribe of Israel can preserve itself even in bondage without a state to protect them. Even if the Jewish female is raped by a non-Jewish

male from a foreign political state society, the female's offspring will still be Jewish and the political responsibility to the Law of Nature and God come before the political obligations and responsibilities to a foreign state via the father who impregnates the Jewish female, and thus Judaism can survive. The complimentary contrasting example of Judaism just described, which eliminates the male father and place of birth as the requirement for political membership in the Jewish society, further defines and proves the natural order and Natural Law definition of natural born Citizen to be defined under the Constitution to be according to a natural order or Natural Law that naturally vests the sovereignty and authority of the state political society to be with the males. Consequently Guthrie's lawsuit is not frivolous, but instead soundly and objectively based upon both fact and Law that have been well known for thousands of years and recognized under the United States Constitution for hundreds of years.

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS SECTION

The self-evident objective political realities of Nature described in Part I above, and particularly defined in point 15, permits a comparative declaration of political reproductive rights between males and females:

a) Both males and females have a natural right to create offspring.

b) Both males and females have a natural right to choose which country their offspring will be natural born citizens of. The male father chooses by his choice in native country to be a citizen of, before the birth of his offspring. The female mother chooses by her choice in male sex partner to produce offspring with. The natural born citizenship status of her offspring is determined by the mother before the pregnancy because it is presumed that she has foreknowledge regarding the father's citizenship.

c) Females have a natural political right recognized in the United States to create naturalized citizens of the United States by choosing to have sex with a foreign non-U.S. citizen male or with a U.S. citizen male from a foreign country that is foreign to the 50 States, like a federal territory or possession for example.

d) Male U.S. citizens do not have the natural physical ability to create naturalized U.S. citizens, thus they have no recognized natural political right under U.S. law or the Constitution to create naturalized citizens. The only way for a male U.S. citizen to create a naturalized

citizen is by statutory construct (adoption), according to the Positive Law powers and not according to the powers derived from Natural Law, which is the opposite jurisdiction.

e) As a result of a through d above in the Declaration of Rights Section, only males can create natural born citizens of some county, and only male U.S. citizens from a State of the union can create natural born Citizens who qualify under Article II to be President. This is what it means to be an American United States citizen.

Part II

Separation of Church and State Issues

How Magnus-Stinson's judgment and dismissal violate Guthrie's rights of conscience and thus violate the First Amendment's prohibition against Church and State intruding into each other's domain.

22) Guthrie brought it to the attention of the Court in his lawsuit filed that he is both Jewish and an Atheist, as his religion is the religion of truth-seeking. Based upon his natural right ability to be able to secure for himself an objective view of reality, based upon observable and objectively provable standards that exist in Nature which permit one to make objective definitions of things from which one can then formulate a basis upon which the most accurate model of reality can be

known and accepted. This is the description of what science is and what a scientist does. Guthrie has a science degree in Applied Physics from Purdue University. Guthrie does not believe in supernatural deities, because Guthrie has no objective provable standard for defining anything as 'supernatural', as by the very definition, *super-natural* things do not exist in Nature, so their nature and form are beyond knowing by any human existing in Nature, like Guthrie. Thus the proposal or decree of something being defined as being in the supernatural realm is purely a matter of arbitrary authority and subjective beliefs, which are purely opinion that cannot establish a fact. Magnus-Stinson's finding that Obama is a President and therefore, natural born Citizen is declared by the Courts to be defined contrary to Nature, is an example of a subjective belief, because the factual basis that is the grounds of her determination does not include the male citizen father from the States in evidence, and therefore her determination does not establish a fact that is observable and provable to exist in Nature or evidence in the record. Magnus-Stinson thereby arrives at the conclusion that Guthrie cannot sue a sitting President and that his case is frivolous because there is no standing and thus no jurisdiction, in the complete absence of evidence. As the Court can plainly see, the determination that Guthrie's suit was frivolous is based upon false evidence that is invented by Magnus-Stinson who is wielding extraordinary arbitrary authority. By

her actions, the government is claiming the right to interpret the meaning and definition of natural born Citizen to allow the Courts to place its meaning and definition to be outside of any standard which a human being is able to objectively prove objectively exists in Nature. This is identical to what a Church religion requiring belief in a supernatural deity does, because the Church doctrine and hierarchy place the definition of their object, which in their case is God rather than natural born Citizen, under their dominion or jurisdiction, and they dictate the definition and meaning of that which is outside of Nature and therefore unknowable. In other words, they define what things are in the supernatural realm. The Court is claiming the same right. By dismissing under 12b(6) in the way Magnus-Stinson did, the government is claiming the right to place the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen to be outside of the Natural realm, thus to be unknowable by Guthrie, and totally subject to the subjective and arbitrary authority of any judge to substitute any unprovable invented definition, and thus not up to Guthrie because he is of the wrong religious viewpoint and he is not allowed to use his brain to objectively determine for himself that the definition is, based upon Nature and Her political laws which are objectively discoverable and knowable and objectively provable and can establish an independent objective verifiable fact in court, which is essential in order to be able to claim an injury and have standing.

No one has done this yet in over four years and in over 100 cases as Guthrie claimed in his lawsuit. Guthrie claimed that the Article II definition of natural born Citizen falls under Nature and Her political laws so that Guthrie can establish an objective fact in court that is independent of his or the Court's arbitrary subjective belief, so that he could solve the standing issues and subject matter issues, and now he has solved them. The Court and government and Obama claim the right to define terms in the Constitution according to supernatural laws to which only they are privy, and thus by their arbitrary subjective belief. Because Guthrie is forced to accept this false version of reality that is outside of Nature and her knowable laws, at the threat of fine or imprisonment if he does not obey false laws, a false President, and false judges, who have granted themselves the right to define objective legal terms according to their will alone and impose their false beliefs upon Guthrie with the authority of the state. Guthrie asks the Court, how is this any different than being forced by the state to worship God or live life under a monarchy dictatorship form of government? If the definition is according to the arbitrary opinions of judges and de facto kings, who are removed from the natural order, then how is Guthrie to know or prove to Judge Barker that his case is not frivolous, because the determination is seen to not be based upon facts that exist in Nature or the courtroom. Guthrie cannot establish that his case is not frivolous and

not a recycling of claims without relying upon the ability to establish a fact, which he cannot do if the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen is not defined according to a Natural order that exists in Nature, but instead according to the arbitrary and unrestrained subjective opinion of a judge. It is not Guthrie that needs to prove that his case is not frivolous and a recycling of claims. Instead the burden of proof at this point, from Guthrie's point of view, is upon the government to prove to Guthrie that his case is frivolous and a recycling of claims. The Court claims that Guthrie has no facts to support his position by denying his sworn testimony that natural born Citizen is defined solely by the citizen father, something that Guthrie did not invent but discovered and reported as fact and swore to it, because Guthrie knows that the definition is objective and provable and can establish a fact, and that it is not Guthrie's subjective arbitrary opinion or hearsay evidence, like the Court's judgment and ruling, which is nothing more that the Court insulting Guthrie and saying Guthrie is a liar. Where are the Court's facts? Does the Court have proof and evidence that Obama is the offspring of a U.S. State citizen father? If so, then bring it forward, because Guthrie has already established the facts in the case by his filing his suit, and the only way to determine that Guthrie's suit is frivolous or dismissible under 12b(6) is to refute Guthrie with evidence that Obama is the offspring of a U.S. State citizen father. Guthrie has

established the fact and already instructed the Court that Obama is not a natural born Citizen because he is not the offspring of a U.S. State citizen father. That is how the political laws of Nature, and the Constitution, and the purpose and Intent of the Framers define those who are qualified to hold the Office of President, and thereby claim to have the consent of the People obtained so that they are a legitimate representative of the People. The Court has no right at all to declare Guthrie's suit frivolous at this time without more evidence from the defendants. Such a ruling would be premature and deny Guthrie access to the facts he needs from the defendants which will prove that his case of fraud and criminal cover-up is not frivolous or a recycling of claims.

23) The facts regarding membership in Jewish society that were just related above in point 21 represent the way in which ancient cultures and societies solved the problem of how to separate the secular political authority of the state from the religious political authority of the Church (people). This is desired as a protection against the state intruding its jurisdiction and dictating its own definitions of Nature and believed reality doctrine to the Church or people, as is being described to be the actions of the defendants above in the previous point 22. The state is not allowed to dictate beliefs regarding the true nature of reality or what constitutes truth regarding what is observed to exist in Nature, as this is not a function of

secular state plenary power or authority granted to the United States government by the Constitution. There is meant to be established a separation of Church and State, which is fundamentally secured by the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen to be according to the political Law of Nature that comes from the male State citizen by his political consent to create natural born Citizens. The government and courts do not have the right to dictate their own versions of truth and of reality regarding what is observed to exist in Nature and dictate with force what people must believe in and accept without any basis in fact that is observed to exist in Nature or in evidence in a Court of Law, and that is contrary to what is observed in Nature and by the citizen and known to be true. A government that can force you to believe in whatever version of reality constitutes truth, according to the government, and that is obviously contrary to observation and reason that is known to the citizen, is a forced Religion or monarchy form of government, not a Sovereign Republic of sovereign citizens as all grade school children are taught that our country is supposed to be, when they learn to recite the pledge of "...allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands". In other words, the citizen is the determiner of fact regarding Nature and Her definitions, including how natural born Citizen is defined, because natural born Citizen is defined solely by natural political laws that exist in Nature, in order to provide political right

protection for male State citizens and their offspring. If the male State citizen or his offspring is not the one to determine and establish that fact, then how in the world is the citizen ever supposed to comprehend what it means to be a citizen under the Constitution of America or what it even was that they were writing and creating when they wrote the Constitution and Article II qualifications? The Court is saying that the People are much too stupid to figure out for themselves what a natural born Citizen is, and it is better left in the hands of the experts like judges and the privileged wealthy billionaire and multimillionaire defendants and their teams of expert attorneys, because they know best, as if the Constitution was not written to be comprehensible for an impoverished mere layman Physics and Math professor from Purdue University with degrees in science who can think. I've actually been told by an attorney's assistant that, "We don't do things that way anymore". Thinking with logic and reason, in order to actually discover for oneself the foundational political Law of Nature that is controlling upon the definition and meaning of natural born Citizen, is apparently not permitted by the state. Most of the attorneys you speak with have never even heard of Natural Law. One incredulous former attorney actually said to Guthrie, "Where is Natural Law declared, authorized, and defined in the Constitution?" You cannot even get past the first three words "We the People...", and you have already encountered the

Natural Law jurisdiction, and it is declared, authorized, and defined right there and throughout the Constitution. This is the level of incompetence and ignorance that appears to be the source of the dereliction that has caused Guthrie to be before the Court. The government is not the one to determine for Guthrie how natural born Citizen is defined. It is Guthrie's job to instruct the government. How in the world can Guthrie even know whether or not he has a case to bring, unless he first figures out what a natural born Citizen is and whether or not he is one, in order to determine if he has an injury? Right, Guthrie knows, you have to hire an attorney to tell you if you are a natural born Citizen or not. Good luck with that one. The government is not the source of what is or is not true, or free to define what constitutes truth or the true nature of reality. Yet the judiciary has taken it upon themselves to be the sole arbiters and determiners of the true nature of reality and truth, and dictate to Guthrie and the American People that Nature defines natural born Citizen according to the government's dictates which is contrary to what is naturally observed. This is the government stuck in the Galileo Syndrome, believing that they can define the Sun to revolve around the planets, and thus brand Guthrie a heretic for challenging a "sitting President" and thus summarily get rid of his case in order to shield the defendants and to maintain the government's own fraudulent version of reality. This is not a function of the plenary powers given to

government and is a violation of the First Amendment, of Guthrie's natural rights of consent, and of his natural right to establish a fact in a U.S. Article III Court in order to be able to establish a factual basis for an injury, claim, and remedy in order to be able to obtain standing and have the government secure his political Liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution's Article II natural born Citizen Clause, and guaranteed by the purpose and intent of the government that is established by the Adoption of the Constitution as prescribed in the Preamble to the Constitution, which is to secure the blessings of Liberty. Therefore, Magnus-Stinson's actions are seen as criminal and a Hate Crime, because she is knowingly and willingly fabricating false facts and committing fraud upon the Court in order to interfere with and prevent natural born Citizen Guthrie, who is an impoverished member of a protected political class based upon his sex (gender) as a male with a national identity as a natural born Citizen offspring from a State citizen father, his right to Liberty, and due process in the courts, and his ability to secure his recognition of his citizenship status based upon his sex as a male. Magnus-Stinson denies Guthrie the ability to secure political liberty and justice rights for himself and the recognition of his native birth national identity as defined by the Constitution, to wit a government headed by a representative natural born Citizen President.

24) The self-evident objective truths described in the points above constitute a self-verifying basis that is independent of Guthrie or Judge Barker, which proves objectively and conclusively that Guthrie has not yet had his case properly and fairly adjudicated before a de jure District Court judge who was not an Obama appointee, indicating that the government has failed to obtain proper authority and jurisdiction to hear Guthrie's case, as it was delivered to a de facto judge appointed by a political authority derived from the country of Kenya and not from the 50 States of the United States of America as required by the natural born Citizen requirements of Article II. Thus it is impossible for Guthrie to be recycling claims, as this is the first time that Guthrie has had his case before a proper jurisdiction before a de jure representative of the District Court in a legitimate process that can produce an appeallable decision, that is not a decision from a foreign political jurisdiction originating from Kenya instead of from the native political jurisdiction originating from the 50 States of the United States of America as is expected in an U.S. appeals court. It is inappropriate for the Court to find dispute at this time with Guthrie's stated facts of Nature and Natural Law and facts surrounding the details of Obama's birth, without any evidence of its own, before we have even heard from the defendants, who might not even have any dispute as they might agree with the facts and law stated, and in light of the evidence presented in all points above in

Part I. The Court and Jane Magnus-Stinson are veritably not even disputing with Guthrie or the evidence in his suit, but instead are actually disputing with Nature's political laws without any evidence, giving the appearance that the Court is acting as an attorney for the defense, intent on ignoring the facts and Law and making up falsehoods for the defendants in order to dispute Guthrie's case as frivolous and thereby provide unlawful obstructive force of fraudulent argument, by twisting Nature out of recognition and bending it to a judge's will in order to summarily dismiss and not have to deal with the merits of Guthrie' case, in order to shield the defendants from the political and legal fallout of their sexist treasonous activity. If the Court wants to dispute the facts of Obama's birth details or the political facts of Nature in order to say Guthrie does not have a case that is meritorious, then the Court must either have proof that Obama is the offspring of a U.S. citizen father, or else the Court's dispute is not with Guthrie and what is in his lawsuit filings, it is with Nature and Her laws and God, as Guthrie did not invent and create the controlling and defining Law of Nature that obviously determines that both the political authority and physical responsibility to create natural born Citizens is solely the responsibility of the U.S. male citizen father who comes from a State of the union. If the Judge dismisses under Rule 12b(6) or finds frivolous, or that this is a recycling of claims, the dismissal will not be because Guthrie did not state a

meritorious case, it will be because the Judge is putting herself above the Laws of Nature and behaving like King George III, refusing to acknowledge and accept the true nature of reality and that there exists a pre-existing superior body of law in Nature that is controlling. Therefore, just because she dismisses and determines that the suit is frivolous, it will not make it so, because baseless pronouncements of frivolousness, based upon a failure to accept the authority of Nature and Her laws to be defining upon definitions of legal terms and judges' pronouncements, on the part of either Judge Barker or the de facto king's appointed agent Magnus-Stinson, cannot alter Natural Law or the Laws of Nature, cannot cause the Sun to orbit the planets, nor make Obama to be a natural born Citizen, or a President, or a sitting President, when he is not the offspring of a U.S. State citizen father.

Part III

Jurisdictional problems for the Court that determine that this case has not been properly dismissed previously and cannot be properly dismissed at this time. The Court actually creates the very issue presented by Guthrie to be adjudicated and thus enjoins the issue by attempting to dismiss as frivolous by declaring Obama to be a President, and thus a natural born Citizen by false legal definition. A legal Catch-22 trick that has been used with intent and knowledge for over four years in the federal courts in a political cover-up to dismiss challenges to Obama's legitimacy and right to hold Office in order to avoid dealing with the merits and maintain Obama's unlawful political power and occupation of the Office of President.

25) There does not appear to be any basis whatsoever to determine that Guthrie's case is frivolous anywhere under Rule 12b or under 12b(6) due to failing to state a proper claim that a remedy can be provided for by the Court, as far as Guthrie is aware, at least nothing of substance that the Court cannot instruct Guthrie on, which warrants a summary dismissal, nothing that cannot be modified with the Court's permission in order to ensure that Guthrie's rights are protected and not trampled by a minor technicality, since he is a layman Pro Se first-time filer with no court experience, but does have a substantive case and important issues at bar. The Venue and Subject Matter and ability to provide a Remedy appear to all be appropriate and well within the jurisdiction of the Court, since Obama is not a sitting President but is in fact a sitting non-President. Thus his removal from that Office is a simple criminal justice matter, not a matter for the Congress which creates any separation of powers issues for a Judge of the judiciary and Congress that prevents a remedy and would thus warrant dismissal under Rule 12b(6), because Congress has no authority to install Obama or maintain him in Office, and their actions are wholly criminal now that they have received Guthrie's lawsuit and now have been shown that Obama is not a natural born Citizen of the United States. They now know. The Court might not even have to go that far as the Congress might step in and remove Obama long before the Court would anyway if

Guthrie could get his day in Court and be heard, as at some point the defendants would have to become worried that the truth is going to come out and the capacity for a defendant to come forward and go public with the information that Obama is not Constitutionally eligible to hold Office would precipitate a necessary political crisis and solve the problem for the Court anyway, so there are others among the defendants who can also act to provide a remedy that the Court has a role in facilitating. Furthermore, Guthrie has a fundamental right recognized and protected by the Constitution in Article I, Section 9, Clause 8; Article I, Section 10, Clause 1; Article II, Section 1, Clause 5, the First, the 5th, the 9th, and the 10th Amendments, and by the *Yick Wo v. Hopkins,* 118 U.S. 356 (1886), sovereignty relationship declaration, and by the Rules of Law and Equity that require voluntary consent first be obtained in order to be under a jurisdiction, duty, or obligation to the government, and by *Nguyen v. INS,* 500 U.S. 53 (2001), which recognizes the male citizen to be the source of created natural born Citizens. All together these authorities ensure that Guthrie will have a *natural right of consent* in his dealings with his native Constitutional government to be both recognized and protected, and to be first obtained by the native Constitutional government from Guthrie. This entitles Guthrie to a natural born Citizen President who is the offspring of a State citizen father like Guthrie. Thus Guthrie has a political right guaranteed and